

Exhibit 2

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
WESTERN DIVISION**

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| JERRY and GOLDA WASHINGTON, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiffs, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | No. 08-00459-CV-W-FJG |
| |) | |
| COUNTRYWIDE HOME LOANS, INC., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |

ORDER

Presently before the Court are various discovery disputes between the parties and plaintiff's motion to amend the scheduling order (Doc. No. 49). The Court finds it necessary to obtain additional information from the parties regarding the substance of certain discovery disputes. Specifically, the defendant shall answer the following questions:

1. Have all HUD-1's for the members of the purported class been produced?
2. If not, why have they not been produced and when does it expect to produce the HUD-1's?
3. Are the HUD-1's that Countrywide provided plaintiffs the final HUD-1's reflecting the final terms and conditions agreed to between Countrywide and the borrower, specifically regarding the fees and charges related to the origination of the loan?
4. For each borrower that Countrywide has identified as a potential class member, does Countrywide have in its possession, or in the possession of an entity under its direction, any other versions of HUD-1's relating to the borrowers' second mortgage other than what has been provided already to

plaintiffs? If so, has Countrywide produced these HUD-1's to plaintiffs? Also, to the extent the other versions of the HUD-1's exist that contain information or fees distinct from those found on the HUD-1's that were produced, defendant shall explain why such discrepancies exist.

5. Upon reading Plaintiffs' Statement of Second Discovery Dispute and Countrywide's response, the Court finds it necessary to inquire further as to the alleged discrepancies in various versions of plaintiffs' HUD-1. With regards to the named plaintiffs' HUD-1, defendant shall provide an explanation why the plaintiffs' loan file contains two HUD-1's that are distinct from one another as well as from the copy of the Washingtons' HUD-1 and the HUD-1 produced at Mr. Washington's deposition. Specifically, defendant shall explain why the HUD-1 in plaintiffs' possession and the HUD-1 produced by defense counsel at Mr. Washington's deposition contain fees and charges that were either "voided" or eliminated in the two HUD-1's found in plaintiffs' loan file.

Defendant shall file its response to the Court's question on or before, **Thursday, March 5, 2009**. Pending the Court's review of defendant's responses to the propounded questions, plaintiff's motion to amend the scheduling order (Doc. No. 49) and all pending discovery disputes received by the Court to date are **PROVISIONALLY DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 2/23/2009
Kansas City, Missouri

/s/ FERNANDO J. GAITAN, JR.
Fernando J. Gaitan, Jr.
Chief United States District Judge